

**Remarks**

Claims 1-7, 9, 12-13, 16-18 and 20-26 are pending. New Claims 20-26 are added in this response.

Claims 1, 9 and 16 were rejected under Section 102 as being anticipated by Kurosawa (6714324).


Claim 1 as amended recites that the controller is configured to determine the type of source media based on data received from a sensor sensing the illuminated source media. Kurowasa determines media/film type by sensing the pattern of "film identifying openings 204a and 204b" in the "leading end portions of film holders 201a and 201b." Kurowasa, column 5, lines 9-14 and column 5, lines 29-38. The film strips do not extend to identifying openings 204a and 204b. Kurowasa, column 5, lines 38-40. Consequently, Kurowasa does not (indeed cannot) teach or suggest determining the type of media/film based on data received from sensing the illuminated source media/film.

The same analysis applied to Claims 9 and 16. Claim 9 recites illuminating at least a portion of the source media, sensing at least part of the illuminated portion of the source media, and determining the media type of the source media based on said sensing. Claim 16 contains similar limitations. As noted above, Kurowasa determines film type by sensing a pattern of holes in the film holder, not by sensing any part of the illuminated film.

Further with regard to the dependent claims, Kurowasa does not teach or suggest determining the translucency of the source media based on said sensing (Claims 13, 18 and 21), sensing an amount of light reflected from at least part of the illuminated portion of the source media (Claims 20, 23 and 25) or determining that the source media is opaque (Claims 22, 24 and 26).

The claims are in condition for allowance. The foregoing is believed to be a complete response to the outstanding office action.

Respectfully submitted,



Steven R. Ormiston  
Attorney for Applicant  
Registration No. 35,974  
208.433.1991 x204